

REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

It is noted that Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over the Asao, et al reference in view of the Ojo reference.

Also, the drawings and the claims are objected to.

In connection with the Examiner's objection to the drawing, applicant submitted herewith replacement drawings of Figures 4, 5 and 7, and amended the specification correspondingly.

It is therefore believed that the Examiner's grounds for the objection of the drawings should be considered as no longer tenable and should be withdrawn.

Claims 7 and 9-12 were amended respectively, and it is believed that the Examiner's grounds of the objection to these claims for formal reasons should be withdrawn as well.

After carefully considering the Examiner's grounds for rejection of the claims over the art, applicant amended Claim 1, the

broadest claim on file, so as to more clearly define the present invention and to distinguish it from the prior art applied against the original claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to define, in addition to other features, that the stator iron (10, 30) has a number of individual laminations (13) which are stacked one above the other, and also has two face ends (22) which rest directly against one another, as particularly disclosed in the specification in the first paragraph of the description of the preferred embodiments on page 3.

Turning now to the references and in particular to the Asao reference, it is respectfully submitted that this reference does not disclose a ratio A formed of the slot area and the end face area. The Ojo reference also does not disclose this arrangement. In addition, the Ojo reference does not provide any hint or suggestion how the slot area or the end area can be oriented. For determination of the ratio A, in the Ojo reference the required parameter d_s is needed, which is for example plotted in Figure 1. Neither the table 1 nor the text of the reference in any of its parts provides any hint or suggestion for an amount of this parameter.

The Ojo reference does not disclose also any hint or suggestion that the ratio A has any role or any significance. Moreover, this reference does not disclose that the concrete amount between 0.4

and 0.8 for the ratio A can be important or provide any advantages. Since the Ojo reference does not make obvious any feature, it is therefore believed that a person of ordinary skill of the art would not find any hint or suggestion to provide optimization in this direction. The new feature of the present invention defined in Claim 1 in accordance with which the ratio A amounts to between 0.4 and 0.8 is not disclosed in the reference and cannot be considered as obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art from the teaching of the reference, since Ojo does not provide any hint or suggestion to optimize the variables to achieve this particular ratio.

The new features of the present invention as defined in Claims 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 cannot be considered as obvious from the combination of the Asao and Ojo references for the same reasons.

Also, the features defined in Claims 7 and 8 cannot be considered as obvious from the combination of the references. Neither the Asao reference nor the Ojo reference disclose a slot fill factor which in combination with the features of Claim 1 provides for an optimized parameter region. Neither the Asao reference nor the Ojo reference discloses the features of Claim 9 that the value c_3 formed of a yoke-side spacing B_{z3} and the slot pitch T_3 can be taken into consideration and provided within a range of 0.45 and 0.65. The value c_3 cannot be derived from the Ojo reference. The value c_3 determined from the slot pitch and

the spacing is not disclosed in this reference and cannot be derived from it.

The same is true with respect to the features of Claim 10. c_2 is a quotient of the slot width toward a tooth head or the spacing b_{z2} and the slot pitch t_2 . Neither Asao nor Ojo discloses this ratio within a corresponding range. Since this ratio is not known from Ojo, an optimization in this direction cannot be considered as obvious from the teaching of the Ojo reference. The same is true also in combination for the features of Claim 11, since this is a combination of the ratios c_2 and c_3 . The feature that this claim combines the values c_2 and c_3 also cannot be considered as obvious from the Asao reference and the Ojo reference, since neither a combination nor this feature cannot be considered as obvious from these references.

The features of Claim 12 are also not disclosed either in the Asao reference or in the Ojo reference.

In view of the above presented remarks and amendments, it is believed that the claims currently on file should be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should be allowed.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27233